DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 074 026 SP 006 092

TITLE	Prototype of Institute for Training Teachers of Minority and Low-Income Students. Director's Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION	Delgado Coll., New Orleans, La.
PUB DATE	[71]
NOTE	30p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	College Curriculum; *Economically Disadvantaged; Educationally Disadvantaged; Educational Problems; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Institutes (Training Programs); Lower Class Students; *Minority Groups; *Student Teacher Relationship

ABSTRACT

An institute which provided sessions every 2 weeks for teachers of socioeconomically deprived students was evaluated. The institute offered studies in the physical, cultural, economic, and educational backgrounds and problems of low-income and minority students; suggested solutions to these problems; examined the provision of compensatory work, methods of obtaining and developing instructional material, behavioral objectives, interactional analysis of teaching by teachers and counselors, student participation in curriculum planning, and student evaluation of teachers and curriculum. This content was selected by the participants: 20 faculty members, five low-income and minority students, and four leaders from socioeconomically deprived communities. The staff included instructors from various universities. Three evaluations of the institute were conducted. The first was an open discussion by participants on course content. The second and third were based on questionnaires about the strengths and weaknesses of the institute and recommendations for future programs. General satisfaction was expressed. Specific conclusions were a) the director of the institute should be a full-time member of the Delgado faculty; b) instructors should have an orientation to the needs of Dalgado College; c) knowledge provided by the instructors was a major strength of the institute; and d) guidance activities and peer counselors should be developed. (Appendixes include correspondence and evaluation questionnaires.) (BRB)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 074026

DIRECTOR'S EVALUATION REPORT

I. Basic Information

A. Delgado Junior College, 615 City Park Avenue, New Orleans, Louisiana 70119

B. Prototype of Institute for Training Teachers of Minority and Low-Income Students (38NIH59-2775)

C. Harris K. Goldstein, D.S.W., Research and Planning, Delgado Junior College, 615 City Park Avenue, New Orleans, Louisiana 70119--telephone 504-486-5403-264, Director

D. Beginning June 1, 1970 - ending August 31, 1971

II. Program Focus

Based on two months of preparation by the director in June and July, 1970, followed by a concentrated full-time study of needs of disadvantaged students for a one-week period by participants in August, 1970, this institute provided part-time training from September, 1970 to June, 1971, for selected Delgado Junior College faculty, both established leaders and potential leaders, in teaching minority and low-income students. The institute design was expected to provide a prototype for and encouragement to other junior colleges to engage in similar activity by means of a report of its content that was to be widely disseminated.

Content was selected jointly by faculty, low-income and minority students, and leaders from socio-economically deprived communities, and then taught by instructors from leading universities. It

SP 006 092

included knowledge of the physical, cultural, economic and educational backgrounds and problems of low-income and minority students; suggested solutions for these; how and when to provide compensatory work; methods of obtaining and developing instructional material; on setting behavioral objectives; use of interactional analysis of teaching by teachers, use of audio-visual material and innovations like peer teachers and counselors, student participation in curriculum planning and student evaluation of teachers and curriculum.

Specifically, from August 3, 1970 to August 7, 1970, 29 participants met on a full-time basis to study the educational needs of low-income and minority students at Delgado Junior College and to plan for the content for this institute. A successful effort was made to get representation from the minority and low-income community and faculty, and from minority and low-income students so that 9 persons in the institute represented these groups. The method of using the group as a whole to plan for the institute generally worked well. Participants were articulate in expressing their needs and in deciding what content they wanted.

In addition to this week-long meeting in August, the director met in November with a committee selected by the group from the group to learn whether instructors and consultants obtained so far met the group's needs. They expressed satisfaction. The director held another full-day planning session with the group as a whole early in February, at about the half way point in the institute, to again evaluate past progress and to determine whether modifications were necessary in future planning. A final evaluation was completed in June.

Beginning in September, 1970, twice-monthly sessions of one day each were held according to plan. These sessions were taught or led by experts in the particular content areas selected, and each session was taped and transcribed, so that the director could look over material in detail in terms of whether it was meeting the needs of the group, and so that members unavoidably absent from a meeting could hear what had transpired. Persons presenting this material are named below. In general, content was organized to move from the general to the specific. That is, general educational problems and needs of low-income and minority students and how these could be met were discussed first, with later focus on specific educational problems and needs of these students and how these could be met. Each session was five hours in length.

Content was as follows:

September

Session 1: Problems Low-Income and Minority Students Bring To College, Both Physical and Educational Disabilities. Panel Members: Mr. Warren McKenna, Director University Health Service, Xavier University, New Orleans, Louisiana; Dr. Gene Hassinger, Medical Director, New Orleans Public School Sysptem; Panel Moderator: Mrs. Mae Charlton, East Jefferson Mental Health Clinic, Metairie, Louisiana.

Session 2: How to Orient and Introduce These Students to College Life. Panel Members: Dr. Robert C. Gowdy, Assistant Dean, Junior Division, Louisiana State University, New Orleans, La.; Mr. Elias Williams, Dean of Men, Xavier University, New Orleans, La.; and Mr. James E. White, Jr. Director of Freshman Studies, Southern University, New Orleans, La.

October

Session 3: General Educational Problems of Low-Income and Minority Students Found at Other Colleges and Methods of Dealing with These. Instructor: Dr. Walter Ehlers, Professor of Social Work, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida

Session 4: Teacher-Student Relationships and the Use of Self by the Teacher as an Aid in Meeting Learning Problems of Students. Instructor: Mr. Larry Pool, Lecturer, School of Social Welfare, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida

November

Session 5: The Meaning and Interpretation of Standardized Tests for Low-Income and Minority Students; Tests That Teachers Can Use Themselves in Class. Instructors: Dr. Mohamed J. Shaik, Director, Division of Education, Xavier University, New Orleans, Louisiana; Dr. Wesley Jay Hansche, Psychology Department, Tulane University, New Orleans, Louisiana

Session 6: Handling Practical Class Problems of These Students, such as Difficulties in Following Directions, Lack of Skills, Student Attitudes to Learning, etc. Instructor: Dr. Melvin Gruwell, Director, Center for Teacher Education, Tulane University, New Orleans, Louisiana

December

Session 7: Hereditary and Environmental Influences Affecting Learning of Low-Income and Minority Students; Suggestions for Dealing with these Based on Empirical Research. Instructor: Dr. Alvin L. Bertrand, Department of Sociology, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana

Session 8: Generalized Discussion of the Relation between Objectives and Remedial Work for These Students. Instructor: Dr. Louis Barrilleaux, Assistant Director, Center for Teacher Education, Tulane University, New Orleans, Louisiana

January

Session 9: Specific Discussion of How to Formulate Objectives in Behavioral Terms for Low-Income and Minority Students. Instructor: Dr. Maurice Dutton, Associates for Research in Business, Education, and Computers, Austin, Texas

Session 10: Selecting Learning Experiences and Compensatory or Remedial Work that Fits Objectives Set for These Students. Instructor: Dr. Maurice Dutton, Associates for Research in Business, Education, and Computers, Austin, Texas

February

Session 11: Use of Educational Media and Resources for Audio-Visual Aids for Low-Income and Minority Students. Instructor: Dr. William J. Quinley, Director--Media Center, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida

Session 12: Mid-point Planning and Evaluation led by Dr. Harris K. Goldstein, Project Director

March
Session 13: Instructional Innovations and Special Compensatory Education Programs for Low-Income and Minority Students. Instructor: Dr. Carol Zion, Special Assistant to the Vice President, Miami-Dade Junior College, Miami, Florida

Session 14: Problems and Solutions in Meeting the Needs of These Students at Malcolm X Junior College. Instructor: Mr. Floyd DuBois, Director Counseling Services, Malcolm X Junior College, Chicago, Illinois

April
Session 15: Improving Teaching Skills and Techniques for Low-Income and Minority Students. Instructor: Dr. Laura Traywick, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina

Session 16: Teacher Evaluation Utilizing a System of Interaction Analysis for These Students. Instructor: Dr. Laura Traywick, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina

May
Session 17: Federal Programs Aimed at Helping the Low-Income and Minority Students and Sensitizing Educators. Instructor: Mr. Donald Peterson, Instructor and Coordinator of Experimental College, City College of San Francisco, San Francisco, California

June
Session 18: Final Evaluation and Summation led by Dr. Harris K. Goldstein, Project Director

III. PROGRAM OPERATION

A. Participants:

A deliberate attempt was made to invite a varied group of participants who represented all of the various disciplines at Delgado Junior College, to include both old and new faculty, faculty of various educational levels, those who were teaching both in the junior college and in the trade school, low-income and minority students and representatives from the low-income and minority community. The people who accepted invitations met expectations as being representative of this varied group. However, while the varied nature of the participants facilitated their presenting different view points to the institute, it also presented a problem in meeting

their varied needs. Instructors who presented material at the institute found it difficult to meet the needs of all concerned, and in an attempt to present "something for everyone" there was a possibility that some participants received less content than they wanted about some of the topics.

There were no specially required criteria for participation, except interest in the topic and (for Delgado faculty) employment at Delgado. If the institute were to be repeated, the director would recommend that everyone have more similarity in educational background (perhaps everyone with a Master's degree), and that credit be given for the institute toward a doctoral degree. The variations in academic disciplines among the group appeared a sound selection device, and should be encouraged, but similarity of interests prior to the institute could be determined by a questionnaire so that the teaching content would be more likely to meet the interests of the entire group.

The number of participants was twenty faculty, five students and four community representatives. The number of instructors, all of whom were part-time was nineteen.

Mention has been made of names and disciplines and backgrounds of the instructors for the institute.

B. Staff:

Participants commented favorably on the depth of knowledge on the part of instructors. The director agreed that this was one of the strengths of the institute. The director also agreed with participants' conclusions that instructors should have had more

knowledge of the specific problems relating to Delgado Junior College. In future institutes, a plan should be made to brief instructors on Delgado before they begin their instruction.

The use of a director who was present only part-time at Delgado, once or twice a month, was a limitation to this institute. In this instance, this plan was used because Dr. John Dwyer, who had originally been named as director, became suddenly ill. When no one else on the Delgado faculty could assume this role, the choice of an outside director became a somewhat forced one. The potential problems were recognized at the onset and while telephone contacts and the taping of sessions helped to make up for this deficiency, future institutes should be directed by someone who is full-time on the Delgado staff, even if only part of his time is devoted to the institute itself.

C. Activities:

The objectives of the program were met in that the instruction was provided to faculty about low-income and minority students on the content they selected. The faculty who participated in the institute also believed the objectives were met as shown by the fact that three-fourths of them indicated they would attend a similar institute. Faculty also commented that the strength of the institute was the breadth and depth, brought in by the instructors. Most learning of participants appeared to take place about the influences that affected the learning of low-income and minority students and on the formulation and writing of behavioral objectives. A number of innovations used at other junior colleges were made known to

Delgado faculty, such as planning work so that no student fails; using variable time limits for the completion of courses; the use of peer teaching and peer counselors; the use of community counselors; having students participate in planning courses and evaluation of their own work and that of the teacher; as well as teacher evaluation of teaching.

The beginning and ending dates of the institute appeared suitable. The week-long period in August was long enough to plan for the institute. Although all instructions had been completed by the original termination date, it was necessary to ask for an extension of 60 days to complete the final report of the institute. This extension was necessary because the funding plan provided only part-time for the director who wrote the report.

The twice-monthly meetings of faculty appeared to work out satisfactorily. What problems of attendance were noted appeared to be due to a small part of the faculty rather than spread throughout the entire group. Better selection of participants would probably have improved the group attendance and made attendance close to 100 per cent.

As mentioned earlier, participants were involved in the original planning of the program, in periodic evaluations and modifications as the institute proceeded, and in the final evaluation of outcome.

D. Evaluation:

Three evaluations were carried out during the course of this institute. The first was by means of an informal discussion with

the committee representing the participants and was held in November, 1970. During this discussion, the committee expressed satisfaction with the progress of the institute and requests were made for more emphasis on solutions to practical teaching problems rather than theoretical material. This resulted in the re-scheduling of some sessions and changes in others.

The second evaluation (mid-point evaluation) was at the 12th session, slightly more than half-way through the institute. This was carried out by means of a questionnaire which revealed that teachers considered most helpful those instructors whose sessions dealt directly with improving their teaching and less helpful those who provided background material on low-income and minority students.

This questionnaire asked which instructors they had liked or enjoyed most and from which instructors they learned the most. There was almost a perfect relationship between the instructors that participants liked and those whose content they considered most useful.

The presentation by Dr. Dutton on behavioral objectives was ranked highest both in terms of liking and usefulness. Next was Dr. Barrilleaux's general discussion on this subject, followed by Dr. Gruwell's material on handling practical class problems. Dr. Hansche's material on testing was closely ranked next. The smallest vote of confidence was given to material on orientation. Other instructors were ranked about equally in the middle of the scale.

After completing these questionnaires at the mid-point meeting, an open discussion was encouraged to obtain suggestions for future content desired. The following suggestions were made and were incorporated into later sessions by locating instructors who could present material of this kind.

1. Participants wanted to know what other institutes were being funded by the Office of Education and what content was being presented at the meetings.

2. They wanted to hear about new and innovative techniques they could use with low-income and minority students.

3. There was an interest in learning about efforts to develop undiscovered potential in these students.

4. The group asked for speakers who "had been on the firing line." That is, those who had engaged in actual contact with low-income and minority students and were speaking from practical experience.

5. The group wanted to hear about three kinds of students; those who were ready for junior college, those who would be ready when they completed compensatory work, and those who might have some potential but who were not yet ready for compensatory or remedial work.

The final evaluation was carried out by means of a questionnaire in three parts and completed anonymously at the 18th session after all instructors had presented their material. A mailed questionnaire was also sent to 50 students taught by participants.

The first part of this consisted of narrative answers to eight questions asking for the chief strengths and chief weaknesses of the institute as seen by participants, what changes they would suggest if the institute were to be replanned, what they learned most, and what they had contributed most to the institute, and what could be brought to other teachers by them. The last two questions were not about the institute itself but were an attempt to get at attitudes by asking indirect questions. Participants were asked if they would be interested in attending other similar institutes and what changes each participant would recommend at Delgado as a result of their experiences in the institute.

The participants were then asked to rank on a 10 point scale the following:

a. Value of the institute to each.

b. Extent of knowledge they gained about the problems of low-income and minority students in general.

c. Their feelings about these students.

The third part of this questionnaire asked teachers to indicate how much they had learned about each of the topics presented in the institute, and whether this had helped them to deal with problems related to these topics. They were asked to reply on a 4-point scale graded adjectively into "muc " "some," "little," and "none." This questionnaire required approximately one hour for teachers to complete.

Results of a content analysis of the first eight questions

follows below:

The chief strength of the institute was seen as the speakers themselves, (reported by a third of respondents) and the variety of actual experiences that they brought (another third). Next was the freedom to talk and discuss the various subjects, and the atmosphere, purpose, and efforts of staff.

Chief weaknesses were reported as a feeling that the institute was too general, that it should have had more focus on the low-income and disadvantaged student rather than on general problems of teaching, (about one-quarter of respondents) and that it should have had more practical rather than theoretical aspects (about another quarter). Others thought that some of the speakers did not understand Delgado's particular problems, the speakers came from too many varied situations, that the participants themselves were too varied in their interest and background, and that some of the participants did not attend or involve themselves in the institute sufficiently.

If the institute was to be planned over, changes suggested were quite varied. About one-third said they would hope that instructors employed would know more about Delgado Junior College, and about the same proportion wanted instructors with more practical knowledge of the topic being presented. About the same proportion asked for more and broader content and believed that the institute would have been improved by participation of more faculty from other colleges.

The most important idea learned from the institute appeared

to be understanding of the low-income and minority students and the recognition of the relationship between faculty attitudes and student problems. This was reported by about one-half of the respondents. The next most frequent comment related to recognition of the individual nature of the student's problems and the specific teaching skills that they acquired to help with these problems.

Most participants had difficulty in telling what they contributed to the institute and limited this to their attitude, attendance, or participation in discussion. A few indicated that they thought they had been able to be helpful by bringing some of the general problems specifically down to Delgado's needs by their knowledge of the institution. Some of the members (apparently from the community) indicated they thought they had contributed their knowledge of community problem.

Almost all participants believed they could bring to other teachers more understanding of the low-income and minority student. They especially believed they had learned more about the students' attitudes. The next most frequently mentioned topic was specific ways of better teaching these students.

Three out of four respondents indicated that they would be very much interested in attending other institutes. About 15 per cent were neutral and about 10 per cent were negative.

The most important change that participants thought should take place at Delgado as a result of the institute was more and better counseling programs, including helping teachers to learn

more about how they could guide students to the counseling services and other resources. (This was mentioned by almost one-half of the respondents). The next most frequently mentioned change was better orientation for students and more individualized instruction. This latter included comments such as the moving at the students pace, better grading, individualized study, developing behavioral objectives, and dissemination of what had been learned to other teachers.

On the second part of the schedule, most teachers or about two out of three rated the institute as more useful than not. About a quarter said it was the best use that could have been made of their time.

About the same proportion, two out of three, rated themselves as having learned something about many problems or a considerable amount about all kinds of problems.

The same proportion (two-thirds) described their attitude as very sympathetic to these students. About a third said they were sympathetic and no one reported little sympathy to them.

When asked about the specific learning about each of the subjects covered in the institute, though there were some negative comments about sociology and about too much theory, the subject which respondents reported as learning the most about was hereditary and environmental influences on the learning of low-income and minority students. This may have been because this subject was covered not only in the sociological lecture but was a basic idea throughout many other sessions. Next most learning was achieved on formulating and writing behavioral objectives. Least learning was

achieved, according to reports from participants, on how to handle physical and educational problems of students, and the use of tests by teachers to obtain an educational diagnosis, and about federal programs aimed at helping low-income and minority students. Except for these reports, learning about the other topics appeared relatively uniform. About one-fourth of the participants tended to say they had learned much, about one-half had learned some and about one-fourth reported they had learned little or none.

IV. CONCLUSIONS:

This was the first institute of this kind that Delgado Junior College had on its campus. As such the general reaction was significant. Teachers and students almost universally wanted more such institutes, and as funds for these can be obtained there will be more of them. The evaluation indicates that the teachers learned a great deal and that there was a definite impact on their teaching.

Major activities that should be changed in future institutes would be to provide a director who is a full-time member of Delgado faculty and on the Delgado campus full-time even though he was assigned to this institute part-time. The second change would be to have instructors who were more familiar with Delgado Junior College's needs and goals or who could be made more familiar with it before they actually began their instruction. Planning would also be improved if the director met with the participants at the end of each session for a brief evaluation of whether that session met their needs or not.

Major strengths were the breadth and depth of knowledge provided by the instructors and the stimulation of faculty to want

other institutes (which was a particular goal of this program).

Delgado is now seeking additional funds for an institute to help faculty learn more about guidance activities and to develop peer counselors, this having been the major recommendation for the next focus of the next institute. In addition, Delgado Junior College has received funds from the Office of Education to begin a program to provide compensatory training to 100 high risk students. The proposal by which these funds were obtained was at least partly stimulated by faculty interest engendered by this institute.

APPENDIX

1. Original invitation to teachers - 6/15/71
2. Brochure (enclosed with above)
3. Letter to faculty invited to submit an application - 6/18/70
4. Letter to students invited to submit an application - 6/18/70
5. Letter to community participants to submit an application - 6/18/70
6. Letter of acceptance for institute - 6/29/70
7. Mid-term evaluation form for participants, February, 1971
8. Final evaluation for for participants, May, 1971
9. Questionnaire for students, May, 1971

DELGADO COLLEGE

Inter-Office Communication

TO _____ Department _____

FROM Marvin E. Thames Department President

Subject Teacher Training Institute Date June 15, 1970

As you may be aware, Delgado has received a grant from the Office of Education to train a selected number of our teachers. This training will be aimed at improving their teaching of disadvantaged students, that is students in whom poverty, past education, or cultural deprivation has produced learning problems.

The persons who will be asked to participate in this training program will be doing so as part of their regular work. You will shortly receive some material describing this institute and inviting you to attend. I will appreciate your accepting this invitation.

Marvin E. Thames

Marvin E. Thames

HKG:MET/rr

CC - Deans and Directors

DELGADO COLLEGE, NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA

Announces

"A Prototype Institute for Training Teacher

of

Minority and Low-Income Students"

under the direction of

Harris K. Goldstein, D.S.W.

Consultant on Research and Planning

Delgado College

Staff will be selected on the basis of content decided on by participants during the first week of the institute.

Stipends of $75/week will be paid each participant for the full time week in August - No stipend will be paid for the remainder of the institute.

There are no funds for travel of participants. No textbooks will be required. No housing is available for participants.

Based on a concentrated week-long study in August, 1970, of needs of disadvantaged students by a group of faculty, students and leaders from the community who know the problems of the disadvantaged, this institute will provide part-time training from September 1970 (one day every two weeks) to June 1971 for selected junior college faculty, in teaching disadvantaged (socio-economically deprived) students.

Content will be selected jointly by faculty, disadvantaged students, and leaders from socio-economically deprived communities, and then taught by instructors from leading universities. It will include knowledge of the cultural, economic and educational backgrounds of disadvantaged students, how and when to provide remedial work, methods of obtaining and developing instructional material, the use of audio-visual aids, use of tutors and peer teachers, and methods of individual and group counseling.

Program begins August 3 - August 7, 1970
Full time daily sessions for this week.

Program continues with two meetings per month, from September 1970 - May 1971 inclusive, of one day each with the day of the week to be selected by participants.

Criteria for Admission:

Participation is limited to persons living in the New Orleans area (within commuting distance of Delgado College) who are teaching, counseling or who have other contact with students from minority and low-income families, students themselves, and persons who are representative of such families from the local community.

In selecting individuals for participation, and otherwise in the administration of this program, Delgado College will not discriminate on the grounds of race, color, or national origin of any applicant or participant.

Credit:

Participants may receive up to 6 hours of credit, as eligible, upon application.

Delgado College

615 City Park Avenue Phone 486-5403
New Orleans, Louisiana 70119

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

June 18, 1970

As you know, a goal of this institution is to provide cultural opportunities for the students who have been educationally deprived. Delgado College has received a federal grant to help in achieving this objective.

You are one of 30 faculty members (from which 20 will be chosen) invited to submit an application for possible participation in an institute on teaching disadvantaged students to be offered on the City Park campus.

After you review the attached material, please complete and return your application for admission before July 1, 1970. On or by July 10, a final determination will be made on those selected for the institute.

Thank you for your cooperation in providing assurance that student needs will be met.

Sincerely yours,

Marvin E. Thames

Dr. Marvin E. Thames
President

HKG:MET/rr

Enclosures

Delgado College

615 City Park Avenue Phone 486-5403
New Orleans, Louisiana 70119

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

June 18, 1970

As you know, a goal of this institution is to provide cultural opportunities for the students who have been educationally deprived. Delgado College has received a federal grant to help in achieving this objective.

You are one of a limited number of students (from which 5 will be chosen) invited to submit an application for possible participation in an institute on teaching disadvantaged students to be offered on the City Park campus.

After you review the attached material, please complete and return your application for admission before July 1, 1970. On or by July 10, a final determination will be made on those selected for the institute.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Marvin E. Thames

Dr. Marvin E. Thames
President

HKG:MET/rr

Enclosures

Delgado College

615 City Park Avenue Phone 486-5403
New Orleans, Louisiana 70119

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

June 18, 1970

As you will note from the enclosed material, Delgado College will begin on August 4, 1970, an institute aimed at helping its teachers understand and be better able to teach disadvantaged students. We would like very much to have you participate in this institute because of your position of leadership in the community, because we feel you can make an important contribution to its success, and because of your special knowledge of and interest in improving the plight of the disadvantaged members of our community.

After you have reviewed the attached material, please return your completed application for admission before July 1, 1970. Notification regarding the final selection of participants will be made by July 10, 1970.

Sincerely yours,

Marvin E. Thames

Dr. Marvin E. Thames
President

HKG:MET/rr

Enclosures

Delgado College

615 City Park Avenue Phone 486-5403
New Orleans, Louisiana 70119

RESEARCH AND PLANNING

June 29, 1970

Dr. Thames has advised us of your application and we are pleased to announce you have been accepted for participation in our Teacher' Training Institute for Disadvantaged Students. If you still wish to participate please return the enclosed card checking your choice, applicant information form and stipend application form by July 20, 1970. If we do not hear from you by that date, we will assume you do not wish to participate.

Sincerely yours,

Harris K. Goldstein, DSW
Project Director

HKG:rr

Enclosures

MID TERM EVALUATION
TEACHER TRAINING INSTITUTE 2/19/71

Please rank the instructors you have had in terms of (1) which ones you liked or enjoyed most; (2) which ones you learned most useful material to help disadvantaged students from.

Put a "1" in front of the one or ones you rank highest; use up to three "1's". Put a "2" in front of those you rank next. Use up to three 2's. Put a "3" in front of those you rank last.

Please do this independently and anonymous. Do not sign your sheet.

		Liked or Enjoyed	Learned Useful Material From
HEALTH SERVICES -	Mr. McKenna		
	Dr. Hassinger		
ORIENTATION -	Dr. Gowdy		
	Mr. Williams		
	Mr. White		
Teaching Problems and Solutions	Dr. Ehlers		
Teachers Use of Self to Help	Mr. Pool		
Testing	Dr. Shaik		
	Dr. Hansche		
Problems in Learning Skills	Dr. Gruwell		
Cultural Background	Dr. Bertrand		
Course Objectives	Dr. Barrilleaux		
Behavioral Objectives	Dr. Dutton		
Use of Media	Dr. Quinly		

On the back, write any comments you like about the institute that will help in further planning.

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PARTICIPANTS
INSTITUTE FOR TEACHER TRAINING, DELGADO COLLEGE
AUGUST 1970 - MAY 1971

Directions: You are being asked to complete the questions below to evaluate the Institute you have just completed, so that your responses may be used to plan better institutes in the future. On the write-in questions, only one or two sentences are expected, though you may write more if you wish. Please try to give an answer to each question and do not leave any questions blank.

1. What was the chief strength of this Institute?

2. What was the chief weakness of the Institute?

3. If you have a chance to plan the Institute over, what is the most important change you would suggest?

4. What is the most important idea you learned from the Institute?

5. What was your most important contribution to the Institute?

6. What can you bring from the Institute to other teachers?

7. To what extent were your experiences at the Institute such that you would elect to attend other institutes at Delgado?

8. What changes would you recommend at Delgado as a result of the content of this Institute?

On the scales below make a vertical line at the place that best describes your reaction. You may mark on a number or between them.

9. Extent of value of the Institute to you.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	of almost no value a waste of time		of some value but more useless than useful		of considerable value- more useful than useless			one of the best uses of my time	

10. Extent of knowledge gained of learning problems of low-income and minority students.
(Note this is how much you learned, not how much you know.)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	learned little and that only about a very few problems		learned some about some problems		learned some about many problems or much about some problems		learned considerable about almost all kinds of problems		

11. Feelings about low-income and minority students.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	I feel little sympathy for them			I feel some sympathy for them			I feel very sympathetic toward them		

12. The following are subjects covered in the Institute. Please indicate the extent you learned about each from the Institute by putting a letter in the parentheses before the statement.

Use M for much or a great deal
Use S for some
Use L for little
Use N for none
Use X before any of the subjects you think were covered in sessions you missed.

( ) What are the physical disabilities low-income and minority students bring to college and the impact on their education.

( ) How to handle these physical and educational problems of low-income and minority students.

( ) Problems in planning orientation and introduction to college life for low-income and minority students.

( ) How to handle problems and how to plan orientation for low-income and minority students.

( ) Knowledge of low-income and minority students' problems with unequal opportunities and poor self concept.

( ) How to handle the above problems in junior college.

( ) Kinds of educationally limiting student classroom behavior.

( ) How to handle student behavior not condusive to learning and how to let the low-income and minority student know what behavior is desirable.

( ) Meaning and use of ACT (American College Tests) and other educational diagnosis tests.

( ) Use of tests by teachers to get educational diagnosis.

( ) Typical low-income and minority student limitations in skills and attitudes toward learning.

( ) How to handle the above problems.

( ) Hereditary and environmental influences affecting learning of low-income and minority students.

( ) How to deal with hereditary and environmental influences on learning in the classroom.

( ) Relationship between goals or objectives and remedial work for low-income and minority students.

( ) How to utilize goals or objectives in providing remedial work for low-income and minority students.

( ) Value of formulating objectives in behavioral terms for low-income and minority students.

( ) How to write behavioral objectives.

( ) Value of the use of audio-visual aids with low-income and minority students.

( ) How to utilize audio-visual materials and equipment in the classroom as an aid in teaching low-income and minority students.

( ) Knowledge of special programs for low-income and minority students at other junior colleges.

( ) How to adopt some of the ideas implemented at other schools into your classroom and school.

( ) Knowledge of different teaching skills and techniques useful in teaching low-income and minority students.

( ) Putting into use various teaching skills and techniques in teaching low-income and minority students.

( ) Knowledge of interaction analysis and teacher evaluation.

( ) How to evaluate yourself or fellow teachers using interaction analysis.

( ) Knowledge of other federal programs aimed at helping educators to better understand and help low-income and minority students.

( ) How to utilize some ideas from other federal programs in your own work.

( ) Knowledge of how to carry on teacher training institutes.

( ) How can teachers learn in institutes to help low-income and minority students.

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENTS
INSTITUTE FOR TEACHER TRAINING, DELGADO COLLEGE
AUGUST 1970 - MAY 1971

Directions: From August 1970 to May 1971, Delgado has had an institute for training certain of its teachers to better teach and help students. Your help in answering these questions will help Delgado to evaluate the effectiveness of this institute and to plan other institutes. For the first three questions, put a check in the box of the answer that fits you best.

1. Did you know this institute was going on?

☐ Yes ☐ No

2. How did you hear about it?

☐ Didn't know of it.

☐ Learned of it from a teacher.

☐ Learned of it from a student.

☐ Don't remember how I Learned.

3. Did you know that _____ was participating in this institute?

☐ Yes ☐ No

4. Put a check in the parentheses before one of the students in each box that you noticed in _____ this year.

( ) Seemed to like me.
( ) Seemed not to like me.
( ) Seemed neither to like nor not to like me.

( ) Good understanding of my particular problems of learning
( ) Poor understanding of my particular problems of learning
( ) Neither poor nor good understanding of my particular problems of learning

( ) Good attempts to meet my learning needs
( ) Poor attempts to meet my learning needs
( ) Neither poor nor good attempts to meet my learning needs

( ) Good understanding of my family background
( ) Poor understanding of my family background
( ) Neither good nor poor understanding of my family background

( ) Good attempt to help me get adjusted to college
( ) Poor attempt to help me get adjusted to college
( ) Neither good nor poor attempt to help me get adjusted to college

( ) Good attempt to help me work at my own speed
( ) Poor attempt to help me work at my own speed
( ) Neither good nor poor attempt to help me work at my own speed

( ) Good attempt to help me catch up on things I hadn't learned before this year.
( ) Poor attempt to help me catch up on things I hadn't learned before this year.
( ) Neither good nor poor attempt to help me catch up on things I hadn't learned before this year.

After you have completed this questionnaire, please return it in the enclosed self-addressed envelope.